

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully acknowledge receipt of the Office Action mailed March 12, 2004. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 39-59, 61-63 and 73-82 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 39-45, 53-59, 61, 73, and 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Callender et al.*; rejected claims 39-45, 52-59, 61, 73, and 79-81 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of *Callender et al.*; and indicated that claims 46, 62, 63 and 82 would be allowable if re-written to overcome the § 112 rejections and claims 47-51 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. In response, Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons set out below.

§ 102(b) Rejection of claims 39-45, 53-59, 61, 73, and 74 over *Callender et al.*

Applicants respectfully submit that the *Callender et al.* reference is not a proper 102(a) reference as it does not show that the invention was known by others prior to the invention by applicants. Specifically, the four of the nine co-authors of the *Callender et al.* reference are named as the inventors of the present application. As attested to in the attached Affidavit of Andy Barron, (Exhibit A), none of the co-authors who are not named as co-inventors of the present invention contributed to the invention of the concepts claimed in the currently pending claims. Thus, any disclosure of concepts relating to the present claims came from the presently named inventors and the *Callender et al.* reference is not a § 102(a) reference against the present application.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 39 and the claims that depend from it are allowable.

§ 103(a) Rejection of claims 34-45, 52-59, 61, 73, 79-81 in view of *Callender et al.*

As set out above, Applicants submit that the *Callender et al.* reference is not available as prior art against the present claims and that the claims are therefore allowable.

Allowable Claims

Claim 46, 62, 63 and 82 have been re-written to recite a singular “body” in the preamble and claims 62, 63 and 82 have been re-written to include a recitation that a ceramic body is formed. Applicants believe that these amendments cure the basis for the rejections under § 112. If the

Examiner disagrees, or would prefer alternative language, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Because claim 46 has been placed in condition for allowance, claims 47-51 are allowable without amendment. Claim 51 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that they have fully responded to the Office Action. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, or otherwise feels it would be advantageous, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (713) 238-8043.

Respectfully submitted,



MARCELLA D. WATKINS

Reg. No. 36,962

Conley Rose, P.C.

P. O. Box 3267

Houston, Texas 77253-3267

(713) 238-8000

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT